

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexasdra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.nepto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE                      | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |  |
|--|----------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/615,738   | 07/09/2003                       | Roger S. Twede       | 100203290-1         | 1826             |  |
| 22879<br>HEWLETT PA  | 7590 11/03/200<br>ACKARD COMPANY | EXAM                 | EXAMINER            |                  |  |
| P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD<br>INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION<br>FORT COLLINS. CO. 80527-2400 |                                  |                      | MCLEAN, NEIL R      |                  |  |
|  |                                  |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |  |
|  |                                  | 2625                 |                     |                  |  |
|  |                                  |                      |                     |                  |  |
|  |                                  |                      | NOTIFICATION DATE   | DELIVERY MODE    |  |
|  |                                  |                      | 11/03/2008          | ELECTRONIC       |  |

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM mkraft@hp.com ipa.mail@hp.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s)    |  |  |
|-----------------|-----------------|--|--|
| 10/615,738      | TWEDE, ROGER S. |  |  |
| Examiner        | Art Unit        |  |  |
| Neil R. McLean  | 2625            |  |  |

| -  |   |   |   |  |  |
|--|---|---|---|--|--|
|  | Neil R. McLean  | 2625  |   |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe  | ears on the cover sheet with the o  | correspondence add  | ress                                      |  |  |
| THE REPLY FILED 14 October 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A  | APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR  | R ALLOWANCE.  |   |  |  |
| <ol> <li>X The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on<br/>application, applicant must timely file one of the following<br/>application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe<br/>for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods:</li> </ol>   | replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi<br>eal (with appeal fee) in compliance  | t, or other evidence, with 37 CFR 41.31; o                | which places the r (3) a Request          |  |  |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.  |   |   |   |  |  |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.   |   |   |   |  |  |
| Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (<br>MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(   | f).   |   |   |  |  |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date<br>have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex<br>under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checket. Any reply received by the Office later<br>may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b)<br>NOTICE OF APPEAL | tension and the corresponding amount of<br>shortened statutory period for reply origing<br>than three months after the mailing date | of the fee. The appropri<br>nally set in the final Office | ate extension fee<br>to action; or (2) as |  |  |
| The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp.   | liance with 37 CFR 41 37 must be t  | iled within two month                                     | s of the date of                          |  |  |
| filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter<br>Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w  | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to   | avoid dismissal of the                                    |   |  |  |
| AMENDMENTS   | ann are anne period del lorar in ex-  | 51 11 4 1.07 (u).   |   |  |  |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, I  | out prior to the date of filing a brief,  | will <u>not</u> be entered be                             | cause                                     |  |  |
| (a) They raise new issues that would require further co  |   | E below);   |   |  |  |
| <ul> <li>(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo</li> <li>(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet</li> </ul>   |   | lucing or simplifying t                                   | he issues for                             |  |  |
| appeal; and/or<br>(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a ∈   | corresponding number of finally reis  | octed claims  |   |  |  |
| NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).   | sorresponding number of finally reje  | cied ciairris.  |   |  |  |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12   | 21. See attached Notice of Non-Cor  | mpliant Amendment (                                       | PTOL-324).                                |  |  |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)   |   |   |   |  |  |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).  | lowable if submitted in a separate, t   | imely filed amendme                                       | nt canceling the                          |  |  |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  |   | be entered and an e                                       | xplanation of                             |  |  |
| Claim(s) allowed:  |   |   |   |  |  |
| Claim(s) objected to:  |   |   |   |  |  |
| Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  |   |   |   |  |  |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE  |   |   |   |  |  |
| <ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu<br/>because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and<br/>was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>   |   |   |   |  |  |
| <ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing<br/>entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to c<br/>showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar</li> </ol>  | vercome all rejections under appea  | l and/or appellant fail                                   | s to provide a                            |  |  |
| 10.   The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio  |   |   |   |  |  |
| REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but   | t does NOT place the application in   | condition for allower                                     | ice hecause:                              |  |  |
| See Continuation Sheet.  |   | CONGRECIA IOI ANOWAN                                      | oc because.                               |  |  |
| <ul><li>12.   Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).</li><li>13.   Other:</li></ul>  | (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)   |   |   |  |  |
| /David K Moore/  | /Neil R. McLean/  |   |   |  |  |
| Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625   | Examiner, Art Unit 2625   |   |   |  |  |

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding Applicant's Argument:

"Yoshiba does not compare pixels of the second frame buffer memory against the pixels of the first frame buffer memory to determine whether changes have been made to the pixels of the first frame buffer memory, in contradistinction to the claimed invention" and "Yoshiba does not discose anywhere that its controller ever compares the display data (i.e., pixels) of the second memory against the display data (i.e., pixels) of the first memory to determine whether changes have been made to the display data of the first memory, in contradistinction to the claimed invention."

## Examiner's Response:

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant for the following reasons:

Toshiba discloses a display memory control system. Figure 1 is a schematic block diagram of a display memory control system. Toshiba discloses a first and second memory (VRAM 16 and VRAM 24) which are controlled by controller CRTC 22 as described in more detail by Yoshiba at Column 3, lines 47-65.

Toshiba discloses a controller that compares, specifically Toshiba discloses in Figure 12, and at Column 7, lines 45-55 an address comparator circuit 300 which comprises two comparators 300a and 300b.

Toshiba further discloses the process by which content is updated if a particular region has changed (Column 8, lines 1-24 and Figure 8). Lastly, Toshiba discloses motivation for only updating the pixels which have changed: to save time and to improve the display by reducing flicker because of a reduction in the 'writing period' (Column 1; lines 19-43).